

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	T i	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,932	9/708,932 11/08/2000		Salman Akram	3434.1US (97-856.1)	4170
24247	7590	03/10/2003		_	<u>-</u>
TRASK B	RITT		EXAMINER		
	P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			MACKEY, JAMES P	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1722	1/
				DATE MAILED: 03/10/2003	′/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

~		1 A. B	mk-1				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/708,932	AKRAM, SALMAN					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	James Mackey	1722	nee				
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication ap							
THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	(1) a timely filed amendme eal (with appeal fee); or (3)	ent which places the application at timely filed Request for Co	on in				
PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thi no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). T fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period	is Advisory Action, or (2) the date re later than SIX MONTHS from AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONT The date on which the petition under of extension and the correspondent.	the mailing date of the linal rejection HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Since the suppropriet of the fee. The appropriating amount of the fee. The appropriations are suppropriet.	See MPEP priate extension priate extension				
fee nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the posts fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the C timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	Office later than three months and 77 CFR 1.704(b).	er the mailing date of the infaireject	tion, even if				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).	CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dis	in the period set forth in missal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered							
(a) they raise new issues that would require fur		search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claims	5.				
NOTE:		. 05 1100 440 Earl	as boon				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s): <u>the rejection under</u>	r 35 USU 112, IIrsi paragraph na	<u> </u>				
overcome.							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) work canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request application in condition for allowance because:	See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims	nent(s) a) will not be ente s would be rejected is prov	ered or b)⊠ will be entered a ided below or appended.	nd an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:						
Claim(s) allowed: none.							
Claim(s) objected to: none.							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,6-20,23-31,34-37 and 39-4</u>	<u>11</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		,					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on			ner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Pape						
10. Other:		James Mai	7				
		James Mackey Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1722 3/	6/03				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Ochiai et al. '831 clearly teaches that the solder bumps completely fill the mold cavities, as clearly shown in Figures 1A, 1B and 2, thus meeting the claimed structural limitations in the mold apparatus claims, notwithstanding the disclosure of Ochiai et al. that said molded solder bumps are intended to be heated to reflow the solder to subsequently form solder balls 20.